



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

KM

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/496,491	02/02/00	GROTH	D BETERSDORF-6

IMS2/0925

NORRIS, McLAUGHLIN & MARCUS P.A.  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW  
220 EAST 42ND STREET  
30TH FLOOR  
NEW YORK NY 10017

EXAMINER

VARGOT, M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1732	7

DATE MAILED: 09/25/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

## Office Action Summary

Application No. <b>09/496,491</b> Examiner <b>M-VARGOT</b>	Applicant(s) <b>GROTH et al.</b> Group Art Unit <b>1732</b>
---	--

**—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—**

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication .
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

### Status

- Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2/2/00.
- This action is FINAL.
- Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- Claim(s) 1 - 8 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- Claim(s) 1 - 8 is/are rejected.
- Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is  approved  disapproved.
- The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- All  Some\*  None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
- received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.
- received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary, PTO-413                     |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948           | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____                                    |

## Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 1732

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: At page 2, lines 19-21, the references to the claims should be deleted.

Appropriate correction is required.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Miekka et al -774 (see the figures and column 4, lines 65-66).

Miekka et al -774 (Fig. 4) discloses the instant process of making a sheet by embossing a polyester (see col. 4, lines 65-66) foil (56) with an embossing roller (58) having holographic structures (col. 3, lines 6-7) and then coating a sheet (52) on the embossed foil. The sheet is also clearly anticipated by the applied reference.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miekka et al -774.

Art Unit: 1732

Miekka et al -774 discloses the basic claimed process as set forth in paragraph 2, supra, lacking essentially that the sheet is a coated film which is cured by electron beam curing, the thickness of the sheet and the thickness of the adhesive layer. It is conventional to apply coverings as coatings which are subsequently cured by electron beam or other radiation and such would have been an obvious feature in the process of Miekka et al -774 dependent on the exact material used for the covering. Note that Miekka et al -774 applies an adhesive (66) between the embossed foil and the sheet and whether such is applied to the sheet or the embossed foil would have been an obvious matter of choice. The exact thicknesses of the coating film and the adhesive layer would have also been a matter of design choice dependent on the exact dimensions desired for the final holographic product.

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Ruschmann and Miekka et al -227 are cited as of interest.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M. Vargot whose telephone number is (703) 308-2621.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

M. Vargot

September 22, 2001

*M. Vargot*  
MATHIEU D. VARGOT  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1300

9/21/01